S.No.	State/UT	No. of projects sanctioned	Total Project Cost sanctioned
6	Goa	0	0
7	Gujarat	3	18.2
8	Haryana	2	15.31
9	Himachal Pradesh	1	1.33
10	Jammu & Kashmir	2	6.11
11	Jharkhand	2	25.00
12	Karnataka	3	27.54
13	Kerala	2	20.07
14	Madhya Pradesh	5	39.01
15	Maharashtra	9	140.53
16	Manipur	1	3.15
17	Meghalaya	0	0
18	Mizoram	0	0
19	Nagaland	3	5.89
20	Orissa	3	61.44
21	Punjab	2	8.53
22	Rajasthan	5	82.18
23	Sikkim	2	0.99
24	Tamil Nadu	7	75.97
25	Tripura	1	12.94
26	Uttar Pradesh	12	98.87
27	Uttranchal	0	0
28	West Bengal	8	141.54
29	A&N Island	0	0
30	D&N Haveli	0	0
31	Daman & Diu	0	0
32	Lakshadweep	0	0
33	Pondicherry	0	0
	TOTAL	96	1102.11

Proposals received and funds allocated for rural roads programme

1919. SHRI RAMDAS AGARWAL: Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) the funds allocated for construction of rural roads during 2001-2002 till date as compared to 2000-2001, State-wise;

(b) the details of projects undertaken under the Rural Connectivity programme during this period, till date, State-wise and what progress has been made as compared to last year;

(c) the details of proposals received from the States for construction/upgradation of roads during the said period State-wise;

(d) whether Government propose to include private sector/NGOs/ foreign agencies in the rural roads programme; and

(e) if so, the details thereof, if any?

THE MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU): (a) For the year 2001-2002, a sum of Rs. 2500 crore has been earmarked for the Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana in the Grant of the Ministry under the State Plan. Pending finalization of State-wise/UT-wise allocations, the State/UT Government have been informed that, at this stage, the available funds may not exceed the last year's allocation, details of which are annexed as Statement (*See* below)

(b) and (c) The State Governments and Union Territory Administrations are in various stages of implementing the project proposals cleared in the year 2000-01 and have been advised to forward those for the current year, 2001-2002. In most States, tenders have been finalized/are being finalized and works already cleared are to commence immediately thereafter.

(d) and (e) Since the execution of works would be through the well-established procedure for tendering through competitive bidding, the private sector has a role to play in the PMGSY. While there is no proposal to include the NGOs in the Programme, keeping in view the scope and magnitude of the same, the possibility of involving the External Funding Agencies is being explored.

Statement

State-wise funds allocated for construction of rural roads during 2001-2002

(Rs. in crore)

	States/UTs	Amount
1	Andhra Pradesh	190
2	Arunachal Pradesh	35
3	Assam	75
4	Bihar	150
5	Chhattisgarh	87
6	Goa	5
7	Gujarat	50
8	Haryana	20
9	Himachal Pradesh	60
10	Jammu & Kashmir	20
11	Jharkhand	110
12	Karnataka	95
13	Kerala	20
14	Madhya Pradesh	213
15	Maharashtra	130
16	Manipur	40
17	Meghalaya	35
18	Mizoram	20
19	Nagaland	20
20	Orissa	175
21	Punjab	25
22	Rajasthan	130
23	Sikkim	20
24	Tamil Nadu	80
25	Tripura	25
26	Uttar Pradesh	315
27	Uttaranchal	60
28	West Bengal	135
	Union Territories	
29	A & N Island	10
30	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	5

	States/UTs	Amount
31	Daman & Diu	5
32	Lakshadweep	5
33	Pondicherry	5
	TOTAL	2370

States where Panchayati Raj elections have not been held

1920. DR. Y. LAKSHMI PRASAD: Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) the States where Panchayati Raj elections have not been held despite being overdue;

(b) where the Panchayati Raj institutions have been empowered with financial autonomy for rural development; and

(c) whether District Planning Committees have been constituted and if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU): (a) Panchayat elections are overdue in the States of Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Andhra Pradesh (for Gram Panchayat), Jharkhand, Gujarat (for Gram Panchayat), Punjab (for Intermediate Panchayat and District Panchayat) and Uttaranchal and in the UTs of Chandigarh (for Intermediate Panchayat) and Pondicherry.

(b) While devolution of powers to Panchayats is a continuing process, State/UTs have devolved financial autonomy upon Panchayati Raj Institutions for rural development in varying degrees.

(c) The District Planning Committees (DPCs) have not been constituted by all the State/UTs. While some States have indicated that they had not constituted DPCs due to pending Panchayat elections, the remaining States/UTs have reported that they wanted the existing District Planning Boards to continue. A Statement indicating the status of DPCs is enclosed.